

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
LEANDRUS YOUNG and ARTURO)
ROJAS CARDONA,)
Defendants.)

2:09-CV-00348-PMP-LRL

ORDER

On July 1, 2010, this Court entered an Order (Doc. #58) denying Defendant Young's Motion for Summary Judgment and granting Plaintiff Aristocrat Technologies, Inc.'s Motion for Further Discovery Pursuant to Rule 56(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Now before the Court are Defendant Young's Second Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #62) and Plaintiff Aristocrat Technologies, Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on the Complaint's Second, Third and Fourth Causes of Action (Doc. #63).

Defendant Young's fully-briefed Second Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #62) addresses ambiguities which this Court noted in its previous Order on Summary Judgment (Doc. #58) entered July 1, 2010. After considering the arguments of the parties on the motion, the Court concludes Defendant's Second Motion for Summary Judgment must be denied, and the issues raised therein resolved at trial.


1 Similarly, the Court finds that Plaintiff Aristocrat's Motion for Partial Summary
2 Judgment (Doc. #63) on its claims for breach of contract and accompanying guarantees
3 must also be denied. While Plaintiff's motion frames issues to be litigated at trial, Plaintiff
4 has failed to show that no genuine issues of material fact remain which would entitle
5 Plaintiff to judgment as a matter of law.

6 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Defendant's Second Motion for
7 Summary Judgment (Doc. #62) is **DENIED**.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff Aristocrat's Motion for Partial
9 Summary Judgment (Doc. #63) is **DENIED**.

10 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties shall forthwith meet and confer,
11 and shall not later than **December 2, 2010** file their joint pretrial order.

12 DATED: November 2, 2010.

13
14 

15 PHILIP M. PRO
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26